

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 26 were pending in the above-identified application. In this amendment, the Applicants are canceling claims 1-12 and 26 and reintroducing originally-filed claim 1-27 as claims 28-54, with select amendments to clarify the claimed subject matter. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. No new matter has been added with this amendment.

Section 102(b): Maine et al.

Claim 1 and dependent claims 2-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0070960 A1 (“Maine”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it relates to new claims 28-39.

New Claim 28.

Applicants have amended originally-filed claim 1 and reintroduced it as new claim 28 for purposes of expediting prosecution. First, claim 28 recites that at least one port is configured to “receive portably-stored content including high definition images . . . , wherein [a] high definition image has a resolution of at least 720 lines.” Support for this amendment is found, for example, in the Specification at paragraph [0057] (E.g., “controller 120 is a central processing unit . . . configured to support resolutions at 1080i, 720p, 480p, 480i or other like formats.”). Resolutions of 720p and 1080i are generally referred to as “high definition” resolutions. Specifically, the resolution of 720p has 720 active vertical lines with 1280 pixels per line, whereas the resolution of 1080i has 1080 active vertical lines with 1920 pixels per line. See Recommendation Practice: Guide to the Use of the ATSC Digital Television Standard (“the ATSC Guide”), Doc. A/54A, 4 December 2004, p. 12 (“The ATSC Standard enables transmission of HDTV pictures at several frame rates and one of two picture formats; these are listed in the top two lines of **Table 5.1**.”), and p. 24 (showing **Table 5.1**). Note that this Guide can be found at: http://www.atsc.org/standards/practices/a_54a.pdf. The Advanced Television

Systems Committee, Inc., (“ATSC”) is an international, non-profit organization developing voluntary standards for digital television.

By contrast, Maine does not appear to teach a media player that receives portably-stored content that includes high definition images. At most, Maine discloses high-definition images from conventional broadcast sources. Maine at paragraph 62 states that:

[t]he television signals may be in a variety of formats. For example, control unit 304 may be configured to process analog, over-the-air radio and television signals; digital, over-the-air radio and television signals; analog and digital cable television and radio signals; and analog and digital satellite television signals. Control unit 304 may also be configured to process high-definition television signals for the latest generation of high-definition television (“HDTV”) sets for output to compatible HDTV monitors attached to the media appliance. (emphasis added).

As such, Maine’s media appliance appears to receive high-definition images only from broadcast sources. Noticeably absent is any teaching or suggestion that Maine’s media appliance receives high-definition images as “portably-stored content,” as set forth in claim 1.

New claim 28 also recites a media player that receives portably-stored content from “a portable storage device capable of storing the high definition images.” As such, the media player set forth in claim 1 is capable of receiving high definition images as portably-stored content from a portable storage device.

By contrast, Maine teaches a media appliance that at most displays content from DVDs in the form of DVD-Video, as the Examiner points out on p. 2, section 1 of the Official Action. For example, Maine teaches at paragraph [0064]: “there may be a processor or board which contains an MPEG-2 decoder for use with DVD-Video.” Persons ordinarily skilled in the art should recognize that MPEG-2 compression techniques, for example, are used to store DVD-Video on DVDs. Generally, DVD-Video provides “DVD-quality” resolutions of about 704 by 480 pixels under current National Television Systems Committee (“NTSC”) Standards. See Specification, paragraph [0003]. The ATSC Guide describes this resolution within entry number 3 of **Table**

5.1 of the ATSC Guide, which precludes it from being equated with term “high definition.” As such, DVD-quality resolutions cannot be said to be equivalent to the two “high definition” resolutions described in **Table 5.1**. Notably, DVD-quality is commonly referred to as “Enhanced Definition TV (“EDTV”). The Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”)–launched web site www.dtv.gov provides a definition for EDTV. See attached “Buying a Digital Television,” www.dtv.gov/DTV_TipSheet.pdf (Enhanced Definition TV: A Better digital television transmission than SDTV with at least 480p, in a 16 x 9 or 4 x 3 display and Dolby digital surround sound. 480p is the quality used by most DVD players.)(emphasis added). The resolution 480p refers to 480 lines of progressively (“p”) scanned images (i.e., 480 by 704), which is generally synonymous with DVD-quality resolution.

Maine does not describe or hint that the content provided by DVDs is of any resolution other than DVD-quality resolutions. Accordingly, Maine does not teach a media player that receives portably-stored content from “a portable storage device capable of storing the high definition images,” and thus fails to teach each of the elements set forth in claim 28.

In conclusion, Applicants submit that Maine neither teaches nor suggests each of the elements set forth in new claim 28. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection in connection with claim 28. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 28 is now in condition for allowance.

New Claims 29-39.

Claims 29-39 depend from allowable independent claim 28 and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection in connection with these claims is respectfully requested.

Section 103(a): Kelly et al. and Prinsen.

New Claims 40 and 49.

As originally filed, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maine in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,047,292 (“Kelly”). Further, claim 22 was rejected

under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maine in view of Kelly and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,825,347 (“Prinsen”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections to the extent they relate to new claims 40-52.

Applicants have amended originally-filed claims 13 and 22 and reintroduced them as new claims 40 and 49, respectively, for purposes of expediting prosecution. Claims 40 and 49 recite “detecting the presence of portably-stored content including high definition images” and “means for receiving a portable storage device capable of storing the high definition images,” respectively. As discussed above, nowhere does the Official Action indicate that Maine teaches equivalent elements. Thus, the combination of Maine and either (1) Kelly taken alone, or (2) with both Kelly and Prinsen, fails to suggest the claimed combinations of elements set forth in claims 40 and claim 49.

In sum, Applicants submit that Maine neither teaches nor suggests each of the elements set forth in new claims 40 and 49 when combined with Kelly and/or Prinsen. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection in connection with claims 40 and 49. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 40 and 49 are now in condition for allowance.

New Claims 41-48 and 50-52.

Claims 41-48 depend from allowable independent claim 40 and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons. Further, claims 50-52 depend from allowable independent claim 49 and are patentable, too, for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that new claims 40-52 are patentable in view of the cited art. Therefore, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection in connection with these claims is respectfully requested.

Section 102(b): Jiang et al.

Claim 26 and dependent claims 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,614,441 (“Jiang”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it relates to new claims 53-54.

New Claim 53.

Applicants have amended originally-filed claim 26 and reintroduced it as new claim 53 for purposes of expediting prosecution. First, claim 53 recites that “a system for displaying electronic art . . . wherein the first HD video and the second HD video have resolutions of at least 720 lines, each of the 720 lines including at least 1280 pixels.”

By contrast, Jiang appears to be directed to displaying only DVD-Video, and thus facilitates the display of images limited to DVD-quality resolution. In fact, Jiang appears to limit his invention to only DVD-Video. See Jiang, col. 3 lines 54-57 (“Since the embodiments of present invention are directed to displaying DVD-Video on the display monitor 150, all references hereinafter to DVD may pertain to DVD-Video.”)(emphasis). Applicants request guidance to understand how Jiang “displays imagery in high-definition form,” as explained in the Official Action. Otherwise, Applicants submit that Jiang fails to teach each and every element of claim 53.

In conclusion, Applicants submit that Jiang neither teaches nor suggests each of the elements set forth in new claim 53. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection in connection with claim 53.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 53 is now in condition for allowance.

New Claim 54.

Claim 54 depends from allowable independent claim 53 and thus is patentable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection in connection with these claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. If there are any other residual formalities that need to be resolved prior to allowing the application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.


Dated: **February 10, 2006**

Cooley Godward LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
Tel: (650) 843-5000
Fax: (650) 857-0663

KRB:dm

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

By:



Kenneth R. Backus, Jr.
Reg. No. 48,861